

Remarks/Arguments

This invention relates to a security arrangement for communication between a user and a network. Claims 1-24 are pending. The Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 1-17 and 20-24 have been allowed. Claims 18 and 19 have been rejected.

In order to more clearly define the invention, Claims 18 and 19 have been amended.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by US 6,161,182 to Nadooshan. Nowhere does Nadooshan show or suggest:

“a mobile terminal sending during session logoff an encrypted logoff request accompanied by a secure seed such that the secure seed appears in the logoff request”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 18 as amended. Rather, in Nadooshan, a token generating server 300 issues a token to a client 400 through network 110. When a user completes a session, a remote equipment acknowledges termination. Nowhere does Nadooshan show or suggest a secure seed in the logoff request by the client. After the client has logged off from the remote equipment, the client notifies the token generating server that the session has been terminated. See column 5, lines 31-33. It is therefore clear that the logoff request of Nadooshan is not accompanied by a secure seed. The Applicants therefore submit that it is clear that the patentability of Claim 18 is not affected by Nadooshan.

Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by US 2005/0025091 to Patel et al.

The Applicants submit that Patel et al is not available to be cited against the instant Application because the filing date of Patel et al (5 August 2003) is subsequent to the filing date of the Applicants' priority document, Provisional Application 60/454,542, filed on 14 March 2003.

Even if Patel et al were available to be cited under 35 USC 102(e), nowhere does Patel et al show or suggest the invention defined by Claim 19 as amended. More specifically, nowhere does Patel et al show or suggest:

“a means to encrypt data using the secure key as a session key; and a means to periodically generate a subsequent session key using the secure seed ”,

as specifically recited in Claim 19 as amended. Rather, Patel et al uses a centralized source of session keys, as described in ¶0019. A mobile node derives a (session) key from key information stored at the mobile node, not from a secure seed, as explained in ¶0020. It is therefore clear that, even if Patel et al were available to be cited against the instant application, it would not affect the patentability of Claim 19.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

The Applicants believe that no fee, other than the fee for an extension, is due. However, if this paper has incurred any further fee, please charge such fee to the Applicants’ Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
JUNBIAO ZHANG ET AL.

by: _____
Catherine A. Cooper, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,877
(609) 734-6440

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: December 20, 2010